



**Manchester  
Metropolitan  
University**

---

Dobbin, Nicholas, Highton, Jamie, Moss, Sam and Twist, Craig (2019) Factors affecting the anthropometric and physical characteristics of elite academy rugby league players: a multi-club study. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 14 (7). pp. 958-965. ISSN 1555-0273

---

**Downloaded from:** <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/622006/>

**Version:** Accepted Version

**Publisher:** Human Kinetics

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsp.2018-0631>

Please cite the published version

<https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk>

**Manuscript Title:** Factors affecting the anthropometric and physical characteristics of elite academy rugby league players: a multi-club study.

## Abstract

**Purpose:** To investigate the factors affecting the anthropometric and physical characteristics of elite academy rugby league players.

**Methods:** One hundred and ninety-seven elite academy rugby league players (age =  $17.3 \pm 1.0$  years) from five Super League clubs completed measures of anthropometric and physical characteristics during a competitive season. The interaction between, and influence of contextual factors on characteristics was assessed using linear mixed modelling.

**Results:** Associations were observed between several anthropometric and physical characteristics. All physical characteristics improved during preseason and continued to improve until mid-season where thereafter 10 m sprint ( $\eta^2 = 0.20$  cf. 0.25), CMJ ( $\eta^2 = 0.28$  cf. 0.30) and prone Yo-Yo Intermittent Recovery Test (Yo-Yo IR) ( $\eta^2 = 0.22$  cf. 0.54) performance declined. Second ( $\eta^2 = 0.17$ ) and third ( $\eta^2 = 0.16$ ) years were heavier than first years, whilst third years had slower 10 m sprint times ( $\eta^2 = 0.22$ ). Large positional variability was observed for body mass, 20 m sprint time, medicine ball throw, countermovement jump, and prone Yo-Yo IR1. Compared to bottom-ranked teams, top demonstrated superior 20 m ( $\eta^2 = -0.22$ ) and prone Yo-Yo IR1 ( $\eta^2 = 0.26$ ) performance whilst middle-ranked teams reported higher CMJ height ( $\eta^2 = 0.26$ ) and prone Yo-Yo IR1 distance ( $\eta^2 = 0.20$ ), but slower 20 m sprint times ( $\eta^2 = 0.20$ ).

**Conclusion:** These findings offer practitioners designing training programmes for academy rugby league players insight into the relationships between anthropometric and physical characteristics and how they are influenced by playing year, league ranking, position and season phase.

**Keywords:** collision sport, physical qualities, contextual factors, player monitoring

## Introduction

The anthropometric and physical characteristics of rugby league players, including **stature, body mass, body composition, speed, strength, power, change of direction speed and intermittent running ability**,<sup>1</sup> can influence career progression,<sup>2,3</sup> discriminate between selected and non-selected players,<sup>4,5</sup> differentiate between age categories,<sup>6</sup> influence on-field performance<sup>7,8,9</sup> and have implications for recovery.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, well-developed physical characteristics might serve to moderate training load and reduce injury risk in team sport athletes.<sup>10,11</sup>

The aforementioned characteristics are potentially influenced by numerous factors, including: playing position,<sup>12</sup> playing age,<sup>6,13</sup> performance standard (i.e. amateur *cf.* professional),<sup>6,14,15</sup> league position<sup>16</sup> and season phase.<sup>16-18</sup> Understanding the role of contextual factors on player characteristics could be informative for **coaches, strength and conditioning coaches and sport scientists** when monitoring and interpreting player progression. However, the extent to which multiple factors influence a comprehensive range of rugby league players' characteristics have not been explored, likely due to the relatively small samples often used.<sup>14,17,18</sup> Indeed, to our knowledge, the only study of this type in team sports was conducted by Mohr and Krstrup,<sup>16</sup> who investigated changes in distance covered during the Yo-Yo Intermittent Running Test level 2 (Yo-Yo IR2) across an entire league in semi-professional soccer players. This study demonstrated that season phase, playing position, number of appearances and league position all influenced Yo-Yo IR2 performance. For example, the highest ranked five teams covered 8-16% greater distance during the Yo-Yo IR2 compared to the five lowest ranked teams, suggesting that Yo-Yo IR2 might influence team success. The authors also reported that Yo-Yo IR2 distance increased during the pre-season period up to mid-season, before reducing at the end of the season. These findings support the need to consider the independent effects of different factors on player characteristics that are deemed important in team sports.

The use of multi-level mixed modelling has recently been applied to account for the influence of multiple factors on total and relative distance, high-speed distance and metabolic power in rugby league.<sup>19</sup> Such an approach might also be used to explore the independent effects of contextual factors on the anthropometric and physical characteristics of rugby league players, whilst concurrently controlling for other variables. Furthermore, the introduction of each anthropometric and

physical characteristic into the model can highlight any interaction between characteristics.<sup>20</sup>

The purpose of this study was therefore to examine the influence of contextual factors on anthropometric and physical characteristics, and their interaction, in elite academy rugby league players from multiple clubs.

## Methods

### *Participants and Design*

With institutional ethics approval, 214 male elite academy rugby league players from five Super League clubs were recruited during the 2016 ( $n = 98/327$ ; 30% of league cohort) and 2017 ( $n = 132/356$ ; 37% of league cohort) season. Of these, 197 players were included in the final analyses, with some individuals competing in both seasons, resulting in a total of 230 ‘player-seasons’ (age  $17.3 \pm 1.0$  years; stature  $180.7 \pm 6.4$  cm; body mass  $87.0 \pm 10.6$  kg) (Supplement 1). Skinfold thickness was recorded for 67 ‘player-seasons’ from three clubs.

A longitudinal observational design was used with anthropometric and physical characteristics assessed at ‘early preseason’, ‘end of preseason’, ‘mid-season’ and ‘end of season’. Early preseason testing took place within the first week of preseason; end of preseason after 12 weeks of training; mid-season after 10/11 competitive league matches (out of 20/22); and the end of season after another 10/11 matches. Players represented all playing positions (hooker, halfback, **wingers**, centre, second row, prop, loose forward, scrum half and stand-off), playing years (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> years) and were categorised as those playing within top- (top 4), middle- (middle 5) and bottom-ranked (bottom 4) teams **based on this final league position in the academy Super League competition** (Supplement 1). All players completed at least two assessments (mean  $\pm$  SD =  $3.3 \pm 0.8$ ) during the season and did not experience any illness or injuries that resulted in 4 weeks or more of missed matches.

Each session was completed at the clubs’ training facilities (artificial turf,  $n = 179$ ; running track,  $n = 51$ ) after at least 48 hours of rest and at the same time of day. Participants were instructed to arrive in a fed and hydrated state, and were habituated to the testing procedures, which were conducted by the same researcher. During each session, players were divided into two groups, with group 1 performing the sprint tests and countermovement jump first and group 2 completing the change of direction test and medicine ball throw. The groups then swapped and came together for the prone Yo-Yo IR1. The order of tests and groups were standardised for all sessions and a

period of 5 minutes was given between each test. Temperature and humidity were typical of the seasonal climate during each session ( $9.6 \pm 1.5$  to  $17.7 \pm 2.6^\circ\text{C}$  and  $72.2 \pm 6.2$  to  $84.8 \pm 8.3\%$ ).

### *Procedures*

Stretch stature was measured using a portable stadiometer (Seca, Leicester Height Measure, Hamburg, Germany) to the nearest 0.1 cm, and body mass (Seca, 813, Hamburg, Germany) to the nearest 0.1 kg. Skinfold thickness was assessed in accordance with International Society for the Advancement of Kinanthropometry with skinfold thickness measured using Harpenden callipers (Harpenden, Burgess Hill, UK) on the right side of the body and the sum of eight sites (triceps, subscapular, biceps, iliac crest, supraspinale, abdominal, thigh, calf) used for analysis. All measures were taken in duplicate with the mean value used, unless the differences exceeded 5%, whereby a third measurement was taken, and the median value used. The same researcher conducted all measurements (intra-rater coefficient of variation (CV) = 1.3%).

Sprint performance was measured using electronic timing gates (Brower, Speedtrap 2, Brower, Utah, USA) positioned at 0, 10 and 20 m, 150 cm apart and at a height of 90 cm. Participants began each sprint from a two-point athletic stance 30 cm behind the start line. Two maximal 20 m sprints were recorded to the nearest 0.01 s with two minutes between each attempt and the best 10 and 20 m sprint times used for analysis possessing a CV of 4.2 and 3.6%, respectively.<sup>21</sup>

Participants completed two countermovement jumps with 2-minutes passive recovery between each attempt. Participants placed their hands on their hips and started upright before flexing at the knee to a self-selected depth and extending up for maximal height, keeping their legs straight throughout. Jumps that did not meet the criteria were not recorded, and participants were asked to complete an additional jump. Jump height was recorded using a jump mat (Just Jump System, Probotics, Huntsville, Alabama, USA) and corrected before peak height was used for analysis, with a CV of 5.9%.<sup>21</sup>

Change of direction performance was measured using electronic timing gates (Brower, Speedtrap 2, Brower, Utah, USA) placed at the start/finish line 150 cm apart and at a height of 90 cm. The test consisted of different cutting manoeuvres over a 20 x 5 m course (see Ref 21) with each effort interspersed by 2-minutes passive recovery. Participants started in a two-point athletic stance 30 cm behind the start line and completed one trial on the left; the timing gates were then moved, and a second trial was performed on the right in a standardised order before the times were combined (CV = 2.5%).<sup>21</sup> Failure to place both feet around

each cone resulted in disqualification and the trial being repeated.

To assess whole-body muscle function, participants began standing upright with a medicine ball (dimensions: 4 kg, 21.5 cm diameter) above their head before lowering the ball towards their chest whilst squatting down to a self-selected depth. With their feet shoulder width apart, in contact with the ground and behind a line that determined the start of the measurement, they were then instructed to extend up pushing the ball forwards striving for maximum distance. Distance was measured to the nearest centimetre using a tape measure from the back of the start line to the rear of the ball's initial landing imprint on the artificial surface. Participants completed two trials interspersed by 2-minutes recovery, with the maximum distance used (CV = 9.0%).<sup>21</sup>

The prone Yo-Yo IR1 required participants to start each 40 m shuttle in a prone position with their head behind the start line, legs straight and chest in contact with the ground. Shuttle speed was dictated by an audio signal commencing at 10 km·h<sup>-1</sup> and increasing 0.5 km·h<sup>-1</sup> approximately every 60 s to the point at which the participants could no longer maintain the required running speed. The final distance achieved was recorded after the second failed attempt to meet the start/finish line in the allocated time. The reliability (CV% = 9.9%)<sup>21</sup> and concurrent validity of this test have been reported.<sup>7</sup>

274

## 275 **Statistics analysis**

276

Linear mixed modelling was used to determine the independent effects of season phase, playing year, playing position, league ranking, and anthropometric and physical characteristics on each dependent variable (Supplement 2). **Data was checked for normality through visual inspection of normal plots of residuals (Q-Q plot).** Once checked, individual players and teams were included as random factors. A “step-up” model was employed beginning with an “unconditional” null-model containing only random factors before fixed factors were introduced and retained upon significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) altering the model as determined by the maximal likelihood test and  $\chi^2$  statistic. The intercept, which represents a modelled value that corresponds to the convergence of all random slopes (i.e. slope for players and teams) once all fixed factors are entered in each model, were derived for each individual's slope as the height at  $x = 0$ . However, as none of the continuous fixed factors were measured at 0 (i.e. 0 kg body mass), the origin was shifted using mean centering. The  $t$ -statistic was converted to effect size correlations ( $\eta^2$ ) and associated 90% confidence intervals (90% CI).<sup>22</sup> Effect size correlations were interpreted as  $< 0.1$ , *trivial*; 0.1-0.3, *small*;

0.3-0.5, *moderate*; 0.5-0.7, *large*; 0.7-0.9, *very large*; 0.90-0.99, *almost perfect*; 1.0, *perfect*.<sup>23</sup> The likelihood of the effect was established using magnitude-based inferences, where quantitative chances of the true effect were assessed qualitatively, as <1%, *almost certainly not*; 1-5%, *very unlikely*; 5-25%, *unlikely*; 25-75%, *possibly*; 75-97.5%, *likely*; 97.5-99%, *very likely*; >99%, *almost certainly*.<sup>23</sup> For clarity, only effects that were considered clear (not necessarily significant) were included. Linear mixed models were constructed using SPSS (Version 24) and interpreted using a pre-designed spreadsheet.<sup>24</sup>

## Results

Exploring the interaction between characteristics revealed that body mass was **negatively** associated with countermovement jump height ( $\eta^2 = -0.26$ ) and prone Yo-Yo IR1 distance ( $\eta^2 = -0.16$ ), and **positively associated** with greater change of direction ( $\eta^2 = -0.21$ ) and 20 m sprint ( $\eta^2 = 0.08$ ) times (Figure 1A). Skinfold thickness was **positively** associated with body mass (Figure 1B). Change of direction time was **positively** associated with 20 m sprint ( $\eta^2 = 0.23$ ) and **negatively** associated with countermovement jump ( $\eta^2 = -0.16$ ) and prone Yo-Yo IR1 performance ( $\eta^2 = -0.15$ ) (Figure 2A). Twenty-meter sprint time was **positively** associated with 10 m sprint performance ( $\eta^2 = 0.85$ ) and **negatively** associated with countermovement jump ( $\eta^2 = -0.31$ ) (Figure 2B). Ten-meter sprint time was **positively** associated with prone Yo-Yo IR1 distance ( $\eta^2 = 0.20$ ) (Figure 2C). Medicine ball throw was **negatively** associated with 20 m sprint time ( $\eta^2 = -0.06$ ) and **positively** associated with countermovement jump performance ( $\eta^2 = 0.27$ ) (Figure 3A). Body mass, change of direction and 20 m sprint time were **negatively** associated with prone Yo-Yo IR1 distance. Full model outputs can be found in Supplement 3.

Body mass was **positively** associated with season phase as indicated by the *very* to *most likely* higher scores at the end of preseason, mid-season and end of the season periods ( $\eta^2 = 0.15$  to 0.30) compared to early preseason. Skinfold thickness was **negatively** associated (i.e. lower) with season phase at the end of preseason through to the end of season when compared to early preseason ( $\eta^2 = -0.31$  to  $-0.68$ ) (Figure 1). Ten-meter sprint ( $\eta^2 = -0.20$  to  $-0.29$ ), change of direction ( $\eta^2 = -0.17$  to  $-0.39$ ) and 20 m sprint ( $\eta^2 = 0.18$  to  $0.23$ ) performance were **positively** associated with season phase as indicated by the *most likely* quicker times at end of preseason through to end of season. Prone Yo-Yo IR1 distance was **positively** associated with season phase and was greater at end of preseason, mid-season and end of season ( $\eta^2 = 0.22$  to  $0.54$ ) compared to early preseason (Figures 2-3). Medicine ball throw was **positively** associated with the mid-season and end of season phases ( $\eta^2 = 0.31$  and



0.52, respectively). Whilst early preseason was included as a dummy variable, changes between end of preseason and mid-season, and mid-season and end of season can be inferred by the effect size correlation. Results indicate that body mass ( $\eta^2 = 0.23$  cf. 0.30), countermovement jump height ( $\eta^2 = 0.28$  cf. 0.30) and prone Yo-Yo IR1 ( $\eta^2 = 0.22$  cf. 0.54) distance increased and skinfold thickness and 10 m sprint times decreased from the end of preseason to mid-season. Performance during the 10 ( $\eta^2 = -0.29$  cf. -0.25) and 20 ( $\eta^2 = 0.18$  cf. 0.23) m sprint tests, countermovement jump ( $\eta^2 = 0.30$  cf. 0.20) and prone Yo-Yo IR1 ( $\eta^2 = 0.54$  cf. 0.45) decreased from mid-season to the end of season whilst skinfold thickness increased ( $\eta^2 = -0.68$  cf. -0.60) and body mass decreased ( $\eta^2 = 0.30$  cf. 0.15).

\*\*\*\*INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE\*\*\*\*

Body mass was **positively** associated with playing year with second and third years heavier ( $\eta^2 = 0.16$  to  $0.17$ ) than first years. Ten-meter sprint time was **positively** (i.e. slower time) associated with being a third year ( $\eta^2 = 0.01$ ).

\*\*\*\*INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE\*\*\*\*

Large positional variability was observed for measures of body mass and 20 m sprint, countermovement jump, medicine ball throw and prone Yo-Yo IR1 performance (Figure 1, 2 and 3). In contrast, less variability was observed between playing positions for skinfold thickness, 10 m sprint time, and change of direction time (Figure 1 and 2).

\*\*\*\*INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE\*\*\*\*

**Positive associations** were observed between middle-ranked teams and countermovement jump height ( $\eta^2 = 0.26$ ) whilst prone Yo-Yo IR1 distance was **positively** associated with top- and middle-ranked teams ( $\eta^2 = 0.20$  to  $0.26$ ; Figure 3C) when compared to bottom-ranked teams.

## Discussion

This is the first study to assess the influence of multiple factors on the anthropometric and physical characteristics of rugby league players, whilst controlling for confounding variables using linear mixed modelling. Our results indicated an interaction between several physical characteristics that are influenced by contextual factors including playing position, league ranking, playing age and season phase.

Understanding the interaction between anthropometric and physical characteristics is important for practitioners when

developing optimal strength and conditioning practices. For example, Delaney et al.<sup>20</sup> reported a positive relationship between body mass and change of direction time, suggesting a greater body mass can negatively influence change of direction speed. However, they noted that lower-body strength and power training could improve change of direction time without compromising a high body mass. Our results indicate that body mass was positively associated with and medicine ball throw and negatively associated with change of direction time countermovement jump height and prone Yo-Yo IR1 distance. This suggests a focus on increasing body mass in academy players can have both positive and negative effects on certain characteristics and requires consideration with respect to long-term athlete development. Furthermore, countermovement jump height was positively associated with medicine ball throw and prone Yo-Yo IR1 distance, reaffirming associations between power and intermittent running.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, based on our model, an increase in body mass of 1 kg would increase change of direction time by 0.46 s. Therefore, increasing academy players' body mass given its positive association with running momentum<sup>12,15</sup> and ball carrying success in match play<sup>25</sup> would potentially impair change of direction ability, countermovement jump and intermittent running. Such findings might suggest that increases in body mass should occur at a similar rate to the development of physical characteristics, particularly in youth and academy players who are required to develop holistically as they progress to senior rugby. Understanding the potential impact of developing a specific characteristic on a range of other important determinants of rugby league performance enables practitioners to make more informed training decisions based on individual player objectives.

Playing age influenced body mass with second and third year players being heavier than first year players. This finding has been observed elsewhere,<sup>26</sup> and is likely a consequence of both increased training exposure and maturation.<sup>26</sup> Our results also indicated a positive association between playing age and 10 m sprint times, suggesting that third year players recorded slower sprint times compared to first years. Slower sprint performance in older academy players has been reported previously<sup>26</sup> and suggests that, despite greater training experience, coaches might place more emphasis on increasing body mass and lean mass in a position-specific manner (i.e. greater focus in forwards) to minimise the discrepancy between academy and senior Super League players.<sup>27</sup> However, such an approach might have a detrimental effect on sprint speed in third year academy players and requires consideration when programming given the importance of sprinting ability to discriminate between playing standards<sup>28</sup> and its influence on performance of ball-carrying success.<sup>25</sup> Whilst our observations suggest increases in body

mass might have a detrimental effect on sprint speed, it is important to recognise that body mass continues to increase as players move into senior rugby league,<sup>27</sup> yet the average sprint times are also lower (i.e. faster).<sup>6</sup> It is possible that rather than body mass *per se*, it is the rapid increase in body mass required in a short time period (3 years) that negatively impacts on sprinting performance, and that practitioners should look to increase body mass and factors that influence sprinting ability (i.e. force, velocity, power) concurrently.

Dated studies on the physical qualities of senior players<sup>29,30</sup> and the recent practice of grouping players (e.g. outside backs, adjustable and hit-up forwards)<sup>5</sup> has limited our current understanding of the positional variability within rugby league. Given the large sample size across multiple clubs, this study offered insight into the influence of playing positions on the anthropometric and physical characteristics of academy rugby league players. Large between-position variability was observed for body mass, 20 m sprint, medicine ball throw, countermovement jump and prone Yo-Yo IR1 performance, while low positional variability was observed for skinfold thickness, 10 m sprint time and change of direction time. Variability between positions is likely influenced by the selection of academy players to playing roles based on physical qualities. For example, larger players are selected into roles that require greater body mass to facilitate greater running momentum and impact forces.<sup>25</sup> Similarly, players with superior intermittent running capacity (e.g. hookers) are best suited to roles that require numerous offensive and defensive involvements.<sup>31</sup> Homogeneity between positions for 10 m sprints and change of direction possibly reflect shared training practices that emphasise speed and agility over short distances because of the limited distance (~10 m) between attacking and defending players during match play and is similar to that observed for 15 and 40 m sprint times across majority of playing positions in senior rugby league.<sup>29</sup> The lack of variability in skinfold thickness between positions probably reflects the generic nutritional advice provided to academy rugby league players and the regular monitoring of body composition.

To the authors' knowledge, no study has explored the differences in anthropometric and physical qualities based on league ranking in rugby league. Our findings concur with those reporting *small* to *large* differences between elite and sub-elite players in rugby league<sup>4</sup> and the results of Mohr and Krstrup<sup>16</sup> who reported an 18-20% greater Yo-Yo IR2 distance in top- and middle-ranked teams compared to bottom-ranked teams in semi-professional soccer. Whilst it is likely that numerous factors influence a team's league ranking, our results suggest that well-

496 developed sprinting ability and rugby-specific intermittent  
497 running might be important for success.

498

499 In agreement with other team sports,<sup>16-18</sup> season phase  
500 influenced the anthropometric and physical characteristics of  
501 rugby league players. All measures (except medicine ball throw)  
502 improved during the preseason period and continued to improve  
503 until mid-season. Between the mid- and late-season phases,  
504 change of direction time and medicine ball throw distance  
505 continued to improve, whereas body mass, 10 m sprint,  
506 countermovement jump and prone Yo-Yo IR1 performance  
507 decreased, and skinfold thickness increased. These results might  
508 be indicative of a decrease in training load over the course of the  
509 season,<sup>17</sup> which might negatively impact on some physical  
510 characteristics. Given the influence some anthropometric and  
511 physical characteristics have on fatigue<sup>7</sup> and their potential  
512 moderating effects on the workload-injury relationship,<sup>10,11</sup> these  
513 findings have important implications for optimal performance  
514 capabilities of players (and teams) at the end of the season. With  
515 this in mind, future research might explore methods of  
516 maintaining the anthropometric and physical characteristics of  
517 players during the latter stages of the competitive season that do  
518 not simultaneously compromise match performance capability.

519

520 Despite the novel approach employed, this study is not without  
521 limitations. While this study uses a large data set from several  
522 clubs, our data still only represent approximately a third of  
523 players in the entire league and is susceptible to the individual  
524 selected clubs' approach to talent identification and  
525 development. Furthermore, we were unable to document to  
526 ethnicity and maturation status of players. Due to the difficulties  
527 standardising measures of training and match load across  
528 multiple clubs, we were also unable to confirm the proposed  
529 reductions in training load that have been reported previously  
530 and whether these were responsible for the changes in physical  
531 qualities.<sup>17</sup> We also did not include any measures of skill-based  
532 performance or muscle strength despite these being important in  
533 rugby league.<sup>26</sup> Future research should look to explore these  
534 limitations by incorporating a league-wide testing battery,  
535 including measures of rugby skills, alongside practical measures  
536 of training and match load.

537

## 538 Practical Application

539

540 The findings of this study highlight the importance of  
541 considering multiple factors when interpreting a players  
542 anthropometric and physical characteristic. Furthermore, we  
543 show the interaction between physical characteristics and  
544 suggests that practitioners need to consider both the positive and  
545 negative consequences of developing particular characteristics

and align this with the player's developmental stage. For example, strength and conditioning coaches working with youth and academy players should look to manage the increase in a player's body mass and improve physical characteristics concurrently. Furthermore, our results underline the importance of considering contextual factors such as playing year and position when assessing or comparing players to national performance standards or selected groups (i.e. first team). We also demonstrated how league ranking and season phase influence several anthropometric and physical characteristics, suggesting practitioners should look to maximise the development of body mass, linear sprint speed, CMJ and intermittent running during the preseason period and strive to maintain these over the course of the competitive season using appropriate training and training loads.

## Conclusion

Using a large sample from multiple clubs, we report on several factors that influence anthropometric and physical characteristics of academy rugby league players. Firstly, practitioners should note the covariance between several anthropometric and physical characteristics when planning strength and conditioning programmes. Our results also indicate that playing position, league ranking, playing age and season phase influence the anthropometric and physical characteristics of rugby league players. Such insight can be used by practitioners to develop individual players based on their playing position and playing age. Practitioners should also consider the in-season training loads in order to negate any negative changes in anthropometric and physical characteristics, particularly towards the latter stages where teams might be looking to succeed in competitions.

## References


1. Chiwaridzo M, Ferguson GD, Smits-Engelsman BCM. A systematic review protocol investigating tests for physical or physiological qualities and game-specific skills commonly used in rugby and related sports and their psychometric properties. *Syst Rev* 2016; 5: doi: 10.1186/s13643-016-0298-1.
2. Till K, Cogley S, O'Hara J, *et al.* Retrospective analysis of anthropometric and fitness characteristics associated with long-term career progression in rugby league. *J Sci Med Sport* 2015; 18(3):310-314.
3. Till K, Jones BL, Cogley S, *et al.* Identifying talent in youth sport: a novel methodology using higher-dimensional analysis. *PLoS One* 2016; 11(5):e0155047.
4. Tredrea M, Dascombe B, Sanctuary CE, *et al.* The role of anthropometric, performance and psychological attributes in predicting selection into an elite development programme in older adolescents rugby league players. *J Sports Sci* 2017; 35(19):1897-1903.
5. Gabbett T, Kelly J, Ralph S, *et al.* Physiological and anthropometric characteristics of junior elite and sub-elite rugby league players, with special reference to starters and non-starters. *J Sci Med Sport* 2009; 12(1):215-222.
6. Gabbett TJ. Physiological characteristics of junior and senior rugby league players. *Br J Sports Med* 2002; 36(5):334-339.
7. Johnston RD, Gabbett TJ, Jenkins DG, *et al.* Influence of physical qualities on post-match fatigue in rugby league players. *J Sci Med Sport* 2015; 18(2):209-213.
8. Dobbin N, Highton J, Moss SL, *et al.* The concurrent validity of a rugby-specific Yo-Yo Intermittent Recovery Test (Level 1) for assessing match-related running performance. *J Strength Cond Res* 2018; doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000002621
9. Gabbett TJ, Seibold AJ. Relationship between tests of physical qualities, team selection, and physical match performance in semiprofessional rugby league players. *J Strength Cond Res* 2013; 27(12):3259-3265.
10. Windt J, Zumbo BD, Sporer B, *et al.* Why do workload spikes cause injuries, and which athletes are at higher risk? Mediators and moderators in workload-injury investigations. *Br J Sports Med* 2017; 51(13):993-994.
11. Malone S, Hughes B, Doran DA, *et al.* Can the workload-injury relationship be moderated by improved strength, speed and repeated sprint qualities? *J Sci Med Sport* 2018; <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2018.01.010>
12. Morehen JC, Routledge HE, Twist C, *et al.* Position specific differences in anthropometric characteristics of elite European super league rugby players. *Eur J Sport Sci* 2015; 15(6): 523-529.

- 646 13. Till K, Scantlebury S, Jones B. Anthropometric and physical  
647 qualities of elite male youth rugby league players. *Sports*  
648 *Med* 2017; 47(11):2171-2186.
- 649 14. Baker DG, Newton RU. Comparison of lower body strength,  
650 power, acceleration, speed, agility, and sprint momentum to  
651 describe and compare playing rank among professional  
652 rugby league players. *J Strength Cond Res* 2008; 22(1):153-  
653 158.
- 654 15. Atkins SJ. Performance of the yo-yo intermittent recovery  
655 test by elite professional and semiprofessional rugby league  
656 players. *J Strength Cond Res* 2006; 20(1):222-225.
- 657 16. Mohr M, Krstrup P. Yo-Yo intermittent recovery test  
658 performances within an entire football league during a full  
659 season. *J Sports Sci* 2014; 32(4):315-327.
- 660 17. Gabbett TJ. Changes in physiological and anthropometric  
661 characteristics of rugby league players during a competitive  
662 season. *J Strength Cond Res* 2005; 19(2):400-408.
- 663 18. Waldron M, Gray A, Worsfold P, *et al.* The reliability of  
664 functional movement screening and in-season changes in  
665 physical function among elite rugby league players. *J*  
666 *Strength Cond Res* 2016; 30(4):910-918.
- 667 19. Delaney JA, Thornton HR, Duthie GM, *et al.* Factors that  
668 influence running intensity of interchange players in  
669 professional rugby league. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*  
670 2016; 11(8):1047-1052.
- 671 20. Delaney JA, Scott TJ, Ballard DA, *et al.* 2015. Contributing  
672 factors to change-of-direction ability in professional rugby  
673 league players. *J Strength Cond Res* 2015; 29(10):2688-  
674 2696.
- 675 21. Dobbin N, Highton J, Hunwicks R, *et al.* Reliable testing  
676 battery for assessing physical qualities of elite academy  
677 rugby league players. *J Strength Cond Res* 2017; doi:  
678 10.1519/JSC.0000000000002280.
- 679 22. Rosnow RL, Rosenthal R, Rubin DB. Contrasts and  
680 correlations in effect-size estimation. *Psychol Sci* 2000;  
681 11(6):446-453.
- 682 23. Hopkins WG, Marshall SQ, Batterham AM, *et al.*  
683 Progressive statistics for studies in sports medicine and  
684 exercise science. *Med Sci Sport Exerc* 2009; 41:3-12.
- 685 24. Hopkins WG. A spreadsheet for deriving a confidence  
686 interval, mechanistic inference and clinical inference from a  
687 p value. *Sportscience* 2007; 11:16-20.
- 688 25. Waldron M, Worsfold PR, Twist C, *et al.* The relationship  
689 between physical abilities, ball-carrying and tackling among  
690 elite youth rugby league players. *J Sport Sci* 2014; 32:542-  
691 549.
- 692 26. Till K, Darrall-Jones J, Weakley JJ, *et al.* The influence of  
693 training age on the annual development of physical qualities  
694 within academy rugby league players. *J Strength Cond Res*  
695 2017; 31(8):2110-2118.



- 696 27. Till K, Jones B, O'Hara J, *et al.* Three-compartment body  
 697 composition in academy and senior rugby league players. *Int*  
 698 *J Sports Physiol Perform* 2016; 11(2):191-196.
- 699 28. Gabbett TJ, Kelly JN, Sheppard JM. Speed, change of  
 700 direction speed, and reactive agility of rugby league players.  
 701 *J Strength Cond Res* 2008; 22(1):174-181.
- 702 29. Meir R, Newton R, Curtis E, *et al.* Physical fitness qualities  
 703 of professional rugby league football players: determination  
 704 of positional differences. *J Strength Cond Res* 2001;  
 705 15(4):450-458.
- 706 30. Gabbett TJ. A comparison of physiological and  
 707 anthropometric characteristics among playing positions in  
 708 sub-elite rugby league players. *J Sports Sci* 2006;  
 709 24(12),1273-1280.
- 710 31. Austin DJ, Kelly SJ. Professional rugby league positional  
 711 match-play analysis through the use of global positioning  
 712 system. *J Strength Cond Res* 2014; 28(1):187-193.

713  
 714  
 715  
 716  
 717  
 718




719  
 720  
 721  
 722  
 723  
 724  
 725  
 726  
 727  
 728  
 729

Figure 1. Effect of fixed factors on body mass (A) and skinfold thickness (B)  
 Note: data expressed as effect size correlation with 90% CI. Effects that cross 0 were non-significant but demonstrated a clear likelihood effect: \*\* likely, \*\*\* very likely, \*\*\*\* most likely.




730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754



755  
756

Figure 2. Effect of fixed factors on change of direction time (A), 20 m sprint time (B) and 10 m sprint time (C).  
 Note: data expressed as effect size correlation with 90% CI.  
 Effects that cross 0 were non-significant but demonstrated a clear likelihood effect: \*\* *likely*, \*\*\* *very likely*, \*\*\*\* *most likely*.



785  
786 Figure 3. Effects of fixed factors on medicine ball throw (A),  
787 countermovement jump (B) and prone Yo-Yo IR1 (C)  
788 Note: data expressed as effect size correlation with 90% CI.  
789 Effects that cross 0 were non-significant but demonstrated a  
790 clear likelihood effect: \*\* *likely*, \*\*\* *very likely*, \*\*\*\* *most*  
791 *likely*